# BEFORE THE STATE TAX APPEAL BOARD OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

JERRY T. RAY,	) ) DOCKET NO.: PT-2003-72
Appellant	;, ) FACTUAL BACKGROUND,
	) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
-vs-	) ORDER and OPPORTUNITY
	) FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW
THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENU	JE )
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,	)
	)
Responder	ıt. )

-----

The above-entitled appeal was heard on October 27, 2004, in Billings, Montana, in accordance with an order of the State Tax Appeal Board of the State of Montana (Board). The notice of the hearing was duly given as required by law. The taxpayer, Jerry T. Ray, appeared on his behalf. The Department of Revenue (DOR), was represented by Commercial Appraiser Ron Halvorson; Appraisers Kate Russell and Genia Mollett; and Manager Sheri Dede.

The duty of this Board is to determine the appropriate market value for the property based on a preponderance of the evidence. By statute (15-2-301, MCA) this Board may affirm, reverse or modify any decision rendered by the county tax appeal board. Testimony was taken from both the

taxpayer and the Department of Revenue, and exhibits from both parties were received.

This Board finds and concludes that the taxpayer failed to support the contention that the DOR had erred in its appraisal and, therefore, denies the appeal. The decision of the Yellowstone County Tax Appeal Board is affirmed.

# FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- Due, proper, and sufficient notice was given of this matter, the hearing hereon, and of the time and place of the hearing. All parties were afforded opportunity to present evidence, oral and documentary.
- 2. The subject property is described as follows:

The residential improvements located upon Tract 2B, Certificate of Survey 1952, Corr. Am. Tract 2 in S2NW, County of Yellowstone, State of Montana (Assessor number: 000D04703A).

- 3. For tax year 2003, the Department of Revenue appraised the subject land at a value of \$15,991 and the subject residence at a value of \$373,380.
- 4. The taxpayer filed an appeal with the Yellowstone County Tax Appeal Board on October 7, 2003, seeking an unspecified reduction in value. The following reason was cited for the appeal:

A vindictive appraiser GENIA MOLLETT.

5. In its December 20, 2003 decision, the county board denied the taxpayer's appeal, stating:

It is the opinion of the Board the Department of Revenue's appraisal is fair & equitable.

6. The taxpayer then appealed that decision to this Board on January 18, 2004, citing the following reason for appeal:

Department agent GENIA MOLLETT did not measure my house (she said walked it) and therefore the sq footage is incorrect.

#### TAXPAYER'S CONTENTIONS

Mr. Ray is not disputing the DOR land value of \$15,991, which the DOR has classified as agricultural for the 21.39 acres.

Mr. Ray took exception with several aspects of the DOR's appraisal of his home: an increase from the prior cycle from \$353,910 to \$373,380 (as a result of the filing of an AB26 form for property review); a difference of approximately \$10,000 in value, under the cost approach, in view of differences of opinion regarding measurement of the home. He also disputed the DOR's assessment regarding the following items:

//

ITEM DESCRIPTION	DOR VALUE	TAXPAYER OPINION OF VALUE
2 air conditioners	\$4,417	\$1,200 each or \$2,400 total
Finished garage	\$19,700	\$9,000
288 square foot porch	\$5,700	\$1,500
Front porch	\$2,400	\$2,000

Regarding the home's built-in appliances, he stated that he is being assessed for a security system he does not have and feels these appliances are valued too high at \$4,800. \$2,400 would be a better number for the wall oven, range, dishwasher, and intercom system. The DOR considers the home's condition to be very good. Mr. Ray discussed several problems with the roof and the siding and estimated a \$50,000 replacement cost. The home has experienced settling, the carpet and appliances are 12 years old and need replacement.

## DOR'S CONTENTIONS

DOR Exhibit A contains photographs of the subject residence and its property record card. The DOR has assigned a quality grade of seven to the home.

Ms. Mollett stated that Mr. Ray filed an AB 26 form for property review on this property in 1993. As a result of an

on-site review of the property, Ms. Mollett discovered that the DOR was erroneously assessing Mr. Ray's home as a one and a half story rather than a two story. That correction was made. The DOR had also assessed the home's driveway as asphalt rather than concrete and made that change. Errors were discovered in the square footage measurements and those were corrected to match the DOR sketch of the home. These changes resulted in an increase in value.

DOR Exhibit B is a copy of the breakdown of the DOR cost approach to value for this home, resulting in a value of \$389,371:

	Acrea	Acreage		Extension			
A. Land	21.39			\$15,991	** 7	Agricultural Value	
B. Residential improvement costs							
Base Costs First floor livin 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor living Attic living Above grade squar	_	1,025 672	\$50.66 \$37.45 \$14.85	7	137,8 34,4 9,9	410	
				\$1	186,2	190_ Subtotal	
Cost Adjustments							
Heating/AC	Air Conditioning		4,417		\$9	,000+	
Plumbing	4 additional fixtu	ures				,808+	
Additions	Finished garage		1,113			,700+	
	Open Porch		288			,700+	
	Open Porch		124			,400+	
	Ornamental Trim		235		2 ,	,400+	
Other Features							
Prefab Fireplace					\$1	1,200+	
Built In Appliances BD, BO, BR, IC, SS 2GO				\$4,800+			
						3,008 Subtotal 4,198	

Grade Factor	Very Good		1.52	\$355,980	RCN
Depreciation	Observed Age 10 years		4%	\$ 14,239 \$341,171	_ Subtotal
Local Index ECF	Economic Condition Facto	r	99% 1.05	\$338,323 \$355,240	RCNLD
C. Other Building	and Yard Improvements				
Concrete Driveway Pole Barn		3,108 2,560	\$1	RCNLD \$2,790 15,350 18,140 RC	NLD
D. <u>Summary</u>					
Land House OBY's			\$3! -	15,991 55,240 18,140 39,371	

DOR Exhibit D is a copy of Section 15-7-139 (1) (2), MCA, which states that:

15-7-139. Requirements for entry on property by property valuation staff employed by department - authority to estimate value of property not entered -- rules. (1) Subject to the conditions and restriction of this section the provisions of 45-6-203 do not apply to property valuation staff employed by the department and acting within the course and scope of the employees' official duties. (2) A person qualified under subsection (1) may enter private land to appraiser or audit property for property tax purposes.

Ms. Mollett addressed Mr. Ray's contention that the DOR square footage measurements were erroneous. Ms. Mollett testified that she and another appraiser visited the property on October 14, 2004, prior to this hearing,

and re-measured the home's exterior. Her testimony was that "we measured it down to the inch and I came up with just a couple minor changes in the back of the home . . . they were same exact sketch that we have had since 1992."

Ms. Mollett speculates that the only difference may be in the measurement of the interior garage wall, which she wasn't able to enter. On October 19, 2004, she called Mr. Ray and asked if they could meet at the home to determine where the inconsistencies might lie. Mr. Ray denied her access.

The land value has never really been in contention. The DOR has appraised it as agricultural land. The total improvement value, \$389,371, equates to a per square foot value of \$84.53, which Ms. Mollett believes is a very fair, if not low, value for a home of this quality.

#### BOARD'S DISCUSSION

The Board finds that the failed taxpayer to satisfactorily demonstrate that the DOR appraisal The DOR has demonstrated that it has performed erroneous. its appraisal in accordance with statute and administrative Mr. Ray disputed many aspects of the appraisal, but did not provide any documentation, other than his opinion,

for his value requests. In addition, Mr. Ray has denied the DOR access to the interior of the home. Such a visit might help address differences of opinion regarding quality grade, measurements, etc.

### CONCLUSION OF LAW

- 1. This Board has jurisdiction of the matter under appeal pursuant Section 15-2-301, MCA.
- 2. §15-8-111 MCA. Assessment market value standard exceptions. (1) All taxable property must be assessed at 100% of its market value except as otherwise provided.
- 3. The appeal of the taxpayer is denied and the decision of the Yellowstone County Tax Appeal Board is affirmed.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

#### ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the State Tax Appeal Board of the State of Montana that the subject property shall be entered on the tax rolls of Yellowstone County by the local Department of Revenue office at a land value of \$15,991 and at an improvement value of \$373,380, as affirmed by the Yellowstone County Tax Appeal Board. However, the DOR is hereby ordered to remove the assessment for a security system, valued at \$1,300, which the taxpayer has stated that he does not have.

Dated this 25th day of February, 2005.

BY ORDER OF THE STATE TAX APPEAL BOARD

(SEAL)

GREGORY A. THORNQUIST, Chairman

JERE ANN NELSON, Member

JOE R. ROBERTS, Member

NOTICE: You are entitled to judicial review of this Order in accordance with Section 15-2-303(2), MCA. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition in district court within 60 days following the service of this Order.

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 25th day of February, 2005, the foregoing Order of the Board was served on the parties hereto by depositing a copy thereof in the U.S. Mails, postage prepaid, addressed to the parties as follows:

Jerry T. Ray 711 Central Avenue Suite 108 Billings, Montana 59102

Office of Legal Affairs Department of Revenue Mitchell Building Helena, MT 59620

Ms. Dorothy Thompson
Property Tax Assessment
Department of Revenue
Mitchell Building
Helena, Montana 59620

Mr. Elwood Hannah, Chairman Yellowstone County Tax Appeal Board 2216 George Street Billings, MT. 59102

Yellowstone County Appraisal Office 175 N. 27<sup>th</sup> St, Suite 1400 Billings, MT. 59107-5013

> Donna Eubank Paralegal